

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
Criminal Revisional Jurisdiction

Before:

The Hon'ble Mr. Justice Jay Sengupta

CRR 3362 of 2025
CRAN 1 of 2025

Ravi Sekhar Kejriwal @ Ravi Kejriwal & Ors.
Vs.
The State of West Bengal & Anr.

For the Petitioners	:	Mr. Satadru Lahiri, Mr. Siddharth Shroff.
For the State	:	Ms. Amita Gaur, Ms. Rajnandini Das.
For the OP No.2	:	Ms. Swati Chowdhury
Heard on	:	01.09.2025
Judgement on	:	01.09.2025

Jay Sengupta, J. :

1. This is an application praying for quashing of a proceeding being GR Case No.722 of 2021 pending before the learned Judicial Magistrate, 13th Court, Calcutta arising out of Posta Police Station Case No.86 dated 15.07.2021 under Sections 498A/406/34 of the Indian Penal Code and under Sections 3 and 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act.

2. Affidavit of service filed on behalf of the petitioners is taken on record.
3. Report filed on behalf of the State is also taken on record.
4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the accused petitioners submits as follows. During pendency of the proceeding, a settlement and compromise has been arrived at between the private parties of all disputes that had led to the registration of an FIR. A prayer for mutual divorce was allowed by the civil Court. As such, the impugned proceeding may be quashed on the ground of compromise.
5. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the de facto complainant supports such contentions of the petitioners and submits that the disputes that had led to the initiation of the impugned proceeding have all been settled between the private parties. In fact, a decree on mutual consent has been awarded in favour of the couple in question.
6. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the State relies on the case diary and the report and submits as follows. There is no injury report present in the case diary. The de facto complainant had written a letter as also given a statement before the Investigating Officer that in view of the settlement of the disputes, the de facto complainant would not like to proceed with the instant prosecution.
7. It appears that a settlement and compromise has been arrived at between the private parties of all disputes that had led to the initiation of the impugned proceeding.

8. In view of the above and in the interest of justice, I quash the impugned proceeding on the ground of compromise and settlement.

9. The revisional application and the connected application being CRAN 1 of 2025 are, accordingly, disposed of.

10. Urgent photostat certified copy of this order may be supplied to the parties expeditiously, if applied for.

(Jay Sengupta, J.)

Sl.no.11/NB